## Case 1:15-cv-00870-VM-VF Document 220 Filed 02/15/23 Page 1 of 2

NEW YORK
LONDON
SINGAPORE
PHILADELPHIA
CHICAGO
WASHINGTON, DC
SAN FRANCISCO
SILICON VALLEY
SAN DIEGO
LOS ANGELES
BOSTON
HOUSTON
DALLAS
AUSTIN
HANOI



FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES

BRIAN A. MCALEENAN DIRECT DIAL: +1 312 499 6762 E-MAIL: BAMcAleenan@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

SHANGHAI ATLANTA BALTIMORE WILMINGTON MIAMI BOCA RATON PITTSBURGH NEWARK LAS VEGAS CHERRY HILL LAKE TAHOE MYANMAR

February 14, 2023

HO CHI MINH CITY

## **BY ECF**

Magistrate Judge Valerie Figueredo Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, New York 10007-1312 Application Granted

Valerie Figueredo, U.S.M.J.

DATED: 2-15-2023

For the same reasons stated at ECF No. 212, the parties' proposed redactions to the January 13, 2023 hearing transcript are approved. The parties are directed to file the redacted version of the transcript on the docket by Friday, February 17, 2023. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate the motion at

ECF No. 228. SO ORDERED.

Re: In re Peerless Networks, Inc. v. AT&T Corp., Civil Action No. 15-CV-870 (VM)(VF)

Dear Magistrate Judge Figueredo:

We write on behalf of AT&T Corp., in response to the Court's Order dated February 1, 2023 (D.E. 226), which directed the parties to submit, by February 15, 2023, any proposed redactions to the transcript of the January 13, 2023 oral argument before the Court concerning Peerless' Motion for Summary Judgment to Enforce Settlement Agreement executed by the parties on July 31, 2018 (D.E. 138, "Argument Transcript"). We have consulted with counsel for Peerless Networks, Inc., and, with counsel's consent, we respectfully write to jointly request redactions of certain items from the Argument Transcript pursuant to, and consistent with, prior Orders entered in this case respecting the confidentiality of materials. (D.E. 28 ¶ 7; D.E. 125 at 2 n.1; D.E. 130; D.E. 212.)

In particular, enclosed herewith is a copy of the Argument Transcript with proposed redactions of certain words on most pages of the Argument Transcript. The intent of each proposed redaction is to conceal from the public record certain confidential provisions of the confidential settlement agreement at issue in these post-judgment proceedings as well as confidential aspects of the parties' respective businesses, including sensitive pricing terms and AT&T's business dealings with other third-party providers. As previously reported to the Court, these confidential settlement provisions reflect and embody highly-sensitive business data, the disclosure of which to third-party competitors could be detrimental to the parties' business. (*See, e.g.,* D.E. 196 at 2.) By contrast, the public can still gain a robust understanding of the legal issues discussed in the Argument transcript based on the un-redacted terms.



Magistrate Judge Valerie Figueredo February 14, 2023 Page 2

For the foregoing reasons, the parties respectfully request that the Court make available to the public a copy of the enclosed, redacted Argument Transcript or, alternatively, a similar copy of the Argument Transcript reflecting the same proposed redactions.

We thank the Court for its consideration of this matter and are available to address any questions the Court might have.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Brian A. McAleenan
Brian A. McAleenan

cc: Counsel of Record (via ECF)
Carole Ludwig, Court Reporter (via e-mail)